

## REMARKS

The Office Action dated September 14, 2004 has been received and carefully noted. The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto. No new matter has been added, and no new issues are raised which require further consideration and/or search. Claims 1-22 are submitted for consideration.

The Office Action stated that claims 3-14, 21 and 22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of claims 3-14, 21 and 22. However, because of the reasons outlined below, Applicants submit that claim 1, upon which claims 3-14, 21 and 22 depend, is distinguishable from the cited reference.

Claims 1, 2 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,864,708 to Croft et al. The rejection is traversed as being based on a reference that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features clearly recited in independent claim 1.

Claim 1, upon which claims 2-22 depend, recites a network device for handling data. The network device includes at least one media port and at least one high speed docking station communicating with the at least one media port. The network device also includes at least one master connected to the at least one high speed docking station. The at least one master is configured to handle and process data received by the at least one media port and passed to the at least one master through the at least

one high speed docking station. The network device is configured to handle media ports of different media types.

As will be discussed below, the cited prior art reference of Croft et al. fails to disclose or suggest the elements of any of the presently pending claims.

Croft et al. teaches a docking station which provides for wireless communication with a portable computer. A wireless transceiver within the portable computer communicates with a wireless transceiver within the docking station. Col. 3, lines 7-11. Within the docking station, the wireless transceiver communicates with a protocol manager. The protocol manager extracts information received from the wireless transceiver and separates information intended for different ports. The information is then forwarded to a port generator which generates control signals and data signals for the ports.

Applicants submit that Croft et al. fails to teach or suggest each element recited in claim 1. Claim 1, in part, recites at least one master connected to the at least one high speed docking station, the at least one master is configured to handle and process data received by the at least one media port and passed to the at least one master through the at least one high speed docking station. The present invention is directed to a switch architecture, wherein the master is attached to detachable media ports. The ports are attached to the master through docking stations and the docking stations are attached to the master through a high speed interface bus. This enables the switch to service media ports of different media types. See paragraphs 0023-0028. Paragraph 0001 of the present inventions states that the switch architecture is independent of the

type of media, wherein the media is the physical connection and protocols that allow data to be received and processed. Croft et al. on the other hand is directed to a docking station which provides for wireless communication with a portable computer. As such, Applicants submit that the docking station recited in the present invention is quite different from the docking station of Croft et al.

The Office Action states that the protocol manager of Croft et al. is the same as the master recited in claim 1. Applicants submit that, in Croft et al., the protocol manager is a component in the docking station that extracts information received in the docking station and separates the information for different ports. On the other hand, the master recited in claim 1 is not a component of the docking station. Instead, the master recited in claim 1 is connected to the docking station and processes data that is transmitted from a media port through the docking station. Therefore, Applicants submit that Croft et al. simply does not teach or suggest at least one master **connected to** the at least one high speed docking station, the at least one master is configured to handle and process data received by the at least one media port and passed to the at least one master through the at least one high speed docking station as recited in claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn because Croft et al. fails to teach or suggest each feature of claim 1 and hence, dependent claims 2, 17 and 20 thereon.

Claims 15, 16, 18 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Croft et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,864,708 to Anderson. The

rejection is traversed as being based on references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited in independent claim 1.

Anderson allows numerous I/O ports to be physically located on a notebook computer with the user of a conventional port replicator, docking station or branching cable. Col. 3, lines 60-64. A fold out port group is provided to obtain the needed space for the I/O ports.

Applicants submit that Anderson does not cure the deficiencies of Croft et al. as discussed above with regard to claim 1 as Anderson does not even suggest at least one master **connected to** the at least one high speed docking station, the at least one master is configured to handle and process data received by the at least one media port and passed to the at least one master through the at least one high speed docking station. Instead, just like Croft et al., Anderson is primarily directed to a retractable port group for use with a portable computer. Moreover, MPEP §2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).” As such, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because neither Croft et al. nor Anderson, whether taken singly or combined, teaches or suggests each feature of claim 1 and hence, dependent claims 15, 16, 18 and 19 thereon.


As noted previously, claims 1-22 recite subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the prior art references cited in the Office Action. It is

therefore respectfully requested that all of claims 1-22 be allowed and this application passed to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Arlene P. Neal

Registration No. 43,828

**Customer No. 32294**

**SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP**

14<sup>TH</sup> Floor

8000 Towers Crescent Drive

Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700

Telephone: 703-720-7800

Fax: 703-720-7802

APN:mm